

Murray History Advisory Board
Minutes for September 23, 2008

Attendance: Jenny Lund, Richard Hansen, Lee Brinton, Sherm Davies, Newel Standley, Kathy Romero, Mary Ann Kirk (staff).

Excused: Karen Greenwell, Winter DeLaMare

Visitor: Student from MHS visiting for school assignment.

1. Minutes for August 26, 2008 were approved with two corrections. New board members introduced themselves.
2. Staff Report
 - Tours during the month were successful. School tours for the museum have been scheduled through September. The museum now features the original Murray Theater movie projector donated by the current owners. The South Valley Museum bus tour had 36 people attend. The Tribune had an great article in the newspaper which generated interest. Next year we may want to consider stopping for lunch.
 - Overall zap revenue was much lower because the sales tax on food was removed. Our grant is significantly lower. Projects needing funding will be limited to other grants we receive such as the CLG grant.
 - National registry questions were clarified. The national register uses contributing and non-contributing language, not A, B, C designations. This lettering system was developed by State History (SHPO) to describe buildings in the RLS process. A and B designations would be considered contributing buildings in a National Registry District. B sites would generally not be strong enough as an individual nomination for the national registry. If we want to nominate isolated homes for the national register, they need to be nominated individually and generally should be A buildings. However, they could be submitted at the same time with some kind of theme.

Jenny reminded the board that the National Register does not have any demolition restrictions. It is only state and local city agencies that can create restrictions.

Mary Ann also noted that our local register is not a regulatory ordinance. It merely states that the owner must contact our office before making architectural changes or demolition. This allows communication. In the event of demolition, the history board must be given a chance to review the home and document it further if desired. In the case of demolition of any building over 50 years old that is not on the register, it must be photographed before demolition.

New board members were interested in some training on the historic preservation “lingo”. Jenny suggested they go on line and read up on some of the preservation material.

- The CLG conference included training on ADA and building codes related to historic preservation. Mary Ann has recommended this training for local building officials at statewide conferences. Gilbert Gonzales, Murray’s building official, has made this suggestion

to the state organization.

- IHC smelter plaza is complete. It is missing some of the features IHC presented to the board such as the sloped wall, but appeared to contain most of the features representing the scale of the stacks. Richard noted it was more of a typical landscape element of the hospital and not a memorial for the stacks. Mary Ann noted they have moved most of the historical wording to three plaques to allow one sign to focus on the new hospital. Signage will be installed soon with a dedication in October to coincide with the one year anniversary of the hospital. We are not sure where the signs will be located and how large they are. The smelter video is being expanded to include the demolition and IHC construction and new CDs will hopefully be ready for this event.
- 3. A summary of current A and B Sites and the inventory from the newly annexed area was reviewed. This information was used to help discuss what direction the board wanted to take related to inclusion of A and B homes on the registry. Currently the register includes all A and B homes built prior to 1920. Jenny explained how the federal government has a national register of historic places. Murray also has a local register using SHPO designations of A, B, and C. She explained the definitions for each. We also have two national register districts on our local register. We have already removed all C buildings.

The real issue is should we treat the B buildings differently prior to 1920 because of their age. We currently have 81 A and 42 B sites outside of the districts. An additional 3 As and 17 Bs are located in the newly annexed areas but most are not on the register yet. This would be 84 A and 59 B buildings outside of the districts. The newly annexed area includes 574 B buildings built after 1920. This illustrates the need to be selective in the more recent time periods.

Several options were considered.

- Retain all individual A and B sites on the register and nominate all A and B sites in the newly annexed areas built prior to 1920 and then be more selective after 1920.
- Retain all A sites on the register as the best examples and selective B sites which document architecture not represented as an A site or have major historical significance.

Discussion items included:

- Buildings built prior to 1920 are being demolished. It is a good educational tool to learn how to identify these buildings.
- The register does require building owners to make contact with our office if they are making changes and demolitions require a board review. This allows more communication.
- Owners have the right to say no to the register. We generally have very few people who object. Most are excited to have the recognition.
- Recognizing B buildings often encourages owners to restore them. The home across from Red Robin is a good example of this. The owners removed siding to expose beautiful brick underneath and won a state award for this restoration project. Newel encouraged members to look at the inside of this home which has been restored.
- Highlighting A sites helps educate the community on buildings that truly represent preservation.

- If B buildings are removed from the register, we should still keep a file of documentation.
- We hope to include all buildings on the register on a website. This could be more time consuming if we include all B buildings.

There was an option to study these buildings a little more. Richard would like to keep everything uniform through all time periods. Newel felt we need to highlight the very best. But he didn't want to lose sight of some of the B homes that might be restored in the future. Lee agreed we don't want to overload the register but we should keep the information we have gathered up to this point. Sherm agreed with the previous statements. Kathy asked if the people living in these homes want to preserve them. Mary Ann said most value the historic character. She did note that many of the historic buildings are used as rental property.

Richard made a motion to limit the register to A sites for all time periods with selected B sites which represent an architectural feature not represented in the registry or have major historical significance. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Richard, Newel, and Lee stressed the importance of maintaining an inventory with the B Sites and any documentation we have previously collected. Mary Ann will have Korral review the A and Bs to verify their designation. Jenny suggested using a subcommittee to review these and bring a recommendation to the board.

4. The Wesley Home at 5197 S Wesley Road was nominated to the local register. Previously approved board policy suggested any building listed on the National Register would automatically be included on our local register. **A motion was made and seconded to designate the Wesley Home on the Murray register.**
5. Mary Ann asked the board if they were interested in learning about conservation districts. Mary Ann thinks it allows neighborhoods to create conservation districts through an ordinance process to protect the character of individual neighborhoods. The city has passed some restrictions to deal with monster homes but this may be another mechanism initiated by the individual neighborhood to help preserve historic character. Board members agreed it would be helpful to at least know how they work. Lee noted that it would be the city council's role to create this option through ordinance. Jenny said the board could review it, recommend it to city council, or keep it in the back of our minds for future consideration. Mary Ann will arrange some training on this.
6. Sherm asked if we have considered smelter community center homes on the register. There is also another home west of 700 West on 5300 South - the Johansen home. Mary Ann thought this home was built after 1920. Jenny said that we can now start to look at buildings after 1920. Jenny suggested Sherm do a little research on this.
7. Richard thanked Jenny for her excellent leadership and service. Board members agreed she has been a great chairman. Next month we will elect a new chair.